

**NRPC DOCUMENTATION NOTES FOR REPP IV TASK A:
UPDATE OF STATEWIDE CONSERVATION LANDS DATABASE, 6/29/01**

Introduction:

NRPC received data from 6 of 12 communities for both new and existing parcels. This included 64 new properties or approximately 1,395 acres. Each respondent included either local tax maps for use in identifying and digitizing the properties or already digitized properties. Where local parcel data was available to NRPC in GIS form, this information was used to reselect key areas transform a digitized coverage. Respondents also completed some or all of the required Tract Data Sheet (TDS) and we then used this information to complete a new attribute table for each property.

A. PROPERTY MAPPING/CODING

With the exception of Amherst, all communities submitted paper tax maps along with a completed TDS from which we mapped the features. A resident in Amherst selected the new parcels from a shapefile he personally created and turned in for our use. NRPC currently maintains parcel databases for Brookline, Hollis, Litchfield and Merrimack, which were used as a source to reselect new polygons. Several properties were easement areas of new subdivisions not yet in the parcel database; these were digitized from the submitted papers. According to the Automation Standards manual, coincident arcs along roads, water, political boundaries or existing parcels were reselected from CSRC data and new parcels were fit to those. No issues associated with coding in the aat file.

B. ATTRIBUTE CODING

For the most part, the TDS was inconsistent with the Automated Standards Manual and this caused a great deal of confusion. Unfortunately, we realized this late in the process. For future years, we would recommend an update to the TDS and will offer suggestions at a later date. To correct this, we placed many calls to the communities and in many instances, improvised approaches or values to incorporate the data. The approach taken for each question on the TDS is described below and is organized according by question.

During the data collection process, NRPC distributed a table describing the contents of select fields which we determined required a thorough review and which we welcomed updates. These included: NAME, PPTYPE, PPAGENCY, LEVEL, MSTATUS, and ACCESS. Updates were received and coded into a regional copy of the adf file and will be made available to CSRC.

The following text is presenting in order of the questions asked on the TDS. Text in <> indicates a field name in the adf file and text in () indicates the value assigned to a given field.

Temporary FIPS-Tract ID

This variable was coded in for all parcels in <TEMP_TID>. Many properties submitted by the communities consisted of 2 or abutting more tax parcels. For this exercise, the total boundary area was mapped and the property was assigned only one TID. Multiple parcels that did not have a shared boundary and were inventoried on the same tract data sheet were each assigned the same TID, and the number of parcels comprising the area was noted in <NOTES>. An example of this is TID # 11095-004 in which two polygons not sharing a common boundary comprise the Brawler Estates Easement.

Town/City

Responses to this question were not coded in the system.

Property Owner

Responses to this field were generally not included in the adf file with exceptions given to TDS forms with no response to “**Easement Holder**”. In these cases, we used the property owner information to populate <PPAGENCY>. There were instances where an individual was listed as a property owner and no easement holder had been indicated. We assigned a new code of (53000) to <PPAGENCY> to indicate an “Individual”. We strongly recommend that CSRC adopt this new value for the state-wide system.

Tract Name

Responses to this question were coded in <NAME>. For new properties where no name was indicated, the tax map and lot number was used as the name. There were many comments requesting a change to the existing names in Conslands. Any change or update of a name to an existing parcel was corrected in a backup adf file and the date of revision was indicated in <DATEALTERED>.

Parcel Name (if multiple tracts)

What few responses we received to this question were coded in <NAME>.

Road Names Fronting Parcel

Responses were given by towns but as no field was included in the adf file to capture this data, the information was not coded in the system.

TID# if this land associated with an existing Parcel

Responses were given by towns but as no field was included in the adf file to capture this data, the information was not coded in the system.

Primary Type of Protection

Responses were coded in <PPTYPE>. There were instances where multiple boxes were checked, each of which indicated (FO) as one of the options. As Fee Ownership may be considered the highest level of protection, we assigned (FO) to <PPTYPE> and recorded the other options in <NOTES>.

Term of Protection

Responses to this question were coded in <PPTERM>. Limited term responses were coded in <PPTERMTYPE>.

Easement Holder

Responses were coded in the field <PPAGENCY> See notes for **Property Owner** for a description of the approach taken when no easement holder was indicated.

Back-up Interest Holder

Only one was indicated, and this was recorded in <SPAGENCY>.

Type of Back-up Protection

There were no responses to this question.

Protection Program

Responses to this question were coded in <PROGRAM>. While “Other” was included as a check off item in the TDS, the Automated Standards Manual did not contain a value for this option. Thus, where respondents indicated “Other”, we assigned the value (18) to reflect this choice. The more specific type of acquisition was then listed in <NOTES>. We recommend that CSRC adopt the value of (18) for the state-wide system.

Date Tract Acquired

Responses to this question were coded in <DATERECORD1>. In the cases where no date was listed, the cell was left blank.

Source Data Notes

The source of information used in mapping the parcel, which in all cases was the tax map and lot number, was recorded in <SOURCE>.

Tract Size

The acreage reported on the TDS or on the source document was recorded in <RSIZE>. For properties consisting of multiple parcels not sharing a common boundary, the value in <RSIZE> represent the aggregate acreage.

Registry Book & Page

Responses to this question were coded in <COBKPG>. In cases where there were no county registry of deeds listed, the cell was left blank. While the automated standards packet indicated the character entry of 2-digit county FIPS code, 3-digit book number, and 3-digit page number, most towns listed a 4-digit book and page number. Since the field allowed for this additional digit, it was included in the adf file.

Level of Protection:

Responses to this question were coded in <LEVEL>. Many communities submitted corrections to the existing coding. These changes to <LEVEL> were added in a backup adf file with the new date of revision recorded in <DATEALTERED>.

Management Status:

Responses to this question were recorded in <MSTATUS>. Many communities submitted corrections to the existing coding. Any change or update to the management status for existing parcels was corrected in a backup adf file with the date of revision recorded in <DATEALTERED>.

Public Access:

Responses to this question were recorded in <ACCESS>. Any change or update to the type of access was fixed in the adf file and date of revision was indicated in <DATEALTERED>.

Other comments about parcel/tract

Comments that were given were incorporated in the <NOTES> field(s).

C. DOCUMENTATION OF CONFLICT

There were several towns that NRPC had difficulties fitting the new conservation parcels to the road base feature. These parcels <LID> field were coded appropriately with (98) in the AAT. For the town of Litchfield, 11075-002 (comprising of 4 parcels) and 11075-005 did not fit well to the GRANIT

base data. The digitized information was transformed according to tics placed in the NRPC parcel database and was accurate to with plus or minus (10) feet of those tics. The NRPC parcel base is considered more accurate in this area of Litchfield in part because many new roads are missing from the GRANIT layer. Also, our experience has shown that DOT road center line ("smartroads") data is very accurate in this town. As the digitized parcels fit very well to boundaries in the NRPC parcel base as well as smartroads, we decided not to adjust these properties to fit with data we knew to be poor.

There was a similar instance in Merrimack with a new parcel (11095-007) not fitting well to the GRANIT base data. In this case, the parcel straddles a road line and no feasible solution was concluded. Again, NRPC decided to preserve the parcel and no adjustment was made.

In some cases, new properties that were extensions of existing properties did not fit well after digitizing. The new property boundaries were then adjusted in order to fit the original conservation lands coverage. Property 11025-009 in Brookline, which is comprised of 2 separate parcels, was just such a case. Milford's 11100-003 was another instance. This parcel was extremely difficult to transform because few reference tics could be established. Each parcel's LID field was coded appropriately with (98) in the AAT. The boundary that was fit to be coincidence with an existing parcel boundary was given a code of (7).

The addition of parcels of 11065-001 in the vicinity of the Hollis/Nashua town line will create several sliver polygons when unioned with existing conservation lands data. The properties currently there do not coincide with CSRC political boundary and several slivers already exist in conservation lands polygons such as 196-051, 196-016 and 196-075 . This area could use some cleaning up during a future update process.

A FINAL NOTE...

All tract data sheets, tax maps, and registry of deeds are available at NRPC and will be organized and made accessible to CSRC. A thumbnail map of the new properties follows.

